DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

APR 2-4 1997

In the Matter of

The Use of N11 Codes and Other Abbreviated Dialing Arrangements

CC Docket No. 92-105

MOTION TO ACCEPT LATE FILED RESPONSE OF BELL ATLANTIC AND NYNEX

Bell Atlantic¹ and NYNEX² file this motion to accept late filed response to certain petitions for clarification in the above referenced proceeding. Due to a computer error in an internal e-mail system, the comments were not transmitted in a timely manner to permit filing with the Commission.

Pursuant to section 1.429(f) of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.429(f), Bell Atlantic and NYNEX have served all parties that filed petitions for reconsideration or petitions for clarification in this proceeding. Replies to Bell Atlantic's and NYNEX's response are not due until May 7, and the parties to this proceeding will have ample time to prepare such pleadings. Because no party will be harmed by this one-day delay, Bell

ListABCDE

The Bell Atlantic telephone companies serving New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia and the District of Columbia.

New York Telephone Company and New England Telephone and Telegraph Company.

Atlantic and NYNEX respectfully request that the Commission include the attached response for consideration in this docket.

Respectfully Submitted,

John W. Goodman (77)

Bell Atlantic John M. Goodman 1133 20th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 392-1497

NYNEX William J. Balcerski 1095 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10036 (212) 395-8148

Dated: April 24, 1997

Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of

The Use of N11 Codes and Other Abbreviated Dialing Arrangements

CC Docket No. 92-105

RESPONSE OF BELL ATLANTIC AND NYNEX

Bell Atlantic¹ and NYNEX² submit this response to certain petitions for clarification of the Commission's *First Report and Order* in this proceeding.

Two petitioners ask the Commission to clarify the meaning of paragraphs 45 and 46 of the *Order*.³ These paragraphs plainly require that if an incumbent local exchange carrier uses 611 and 811 for access to repair and business office services, then it must arrange for resellers of its services to be able to use these codes for access to their repair and business office services.⁴ If the incumbent does not use those codes, then it has is no obligation to enable their use by resellers.

This is apparent from the reason the Commission gave for imposing this requirement — "access to these codes for repair and business office uses by only one facilities-

The Bell Atlantic telephone companies serve New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia and the District of Columbia.

New York Telephone Company and New England Telephone and Telegraph Company.

Ameritech Petition at 3-8; BellSouth Petition at ii, 10-11.

A competitor with its own switch would be able to use these codes in any circumstances without any assistance from the incumbent.

based carrier serving that market would be anticompetitive."⁵ There would be no anticompetitive impact — and, therefore, no need to impose an obligation — if the incumbent is not using the codes itself.

ISA asks that the Commission, by "clarification," apply a new set of rules to enhanced services provided through N11 codes. The *Order* reasonably requires that if an exchange carrier offers such services through an N11 code, then it must offer "access to the code on a reasonable, nondiscriminatory basis" to competitors. ISA says that this reference to nondiscrimination incorporates all the rules adopted by the Commission in its *Non-Accounting Safeguards* proceeding. With a wave of its magic wand, ISA cannot transform a simple requirement to provide nondiscriminatory access to a special, scarce numbering resource into the imposition of eight pages of new regulations.

Furthermore, the Commission already has effective regulations governing Bell company information services, and ISA has not suggested why these are inadequate for N11 information services.

Finally, it would be wrong for the Commission to extend its section 272 rules to these services. Section 272 established special "safeguards" for particular Bell company services. Congress did not, as it easily could have, require these rules for all competitive services

Order ¶ 46.

⁶ Order ¶ 48.

⁷ ISA Petition at 3.

provided by a Bell company. The fact that the section specifically requires rules for *interLATA* information services indicates that Congress saw no need for rules for other information services.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL ATLANTIC NYNEX

John M. Goodman

Bell Atlantic John M. Goodman 1133 20th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 392-1497

NYNEX William J. Balcerski 1095 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10036 (212) 395-8148

Dated: April 23, 1997

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 24th day of April, 1997 a copy of the foregoing "Motion to Accept Late Filed Response of Bell Atlantic and NYNEX" was sent by first class mail, postage prepaid, to the parties on the attached list.

Tracev M DeVaux

Kenneth D. Patrich Wilkinson, Barker, Knauer & Quinn 1735 New York Avenue, NW Suite 600 Washington, DC 20006

Counsel for Arch Communications Group, Inc.

M. Robert Sutherland Theodore R. Kingsley BellSouth Corporation Suite 1700 1155 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30309-3610

Martin W. Bercovici Susan M. Hafeli Keller and Heckman, LLP 1001 G Street, NW Suite 500 West Washington, DC 20001

Counsel for Inatl. Association of Fire Chiefs

Frank Michael Panek Larry A. Peck Attorneys for Ameritech 2000 West Ameritech Center Dr. Room 4H86 Hoffman Estates, IL 60196

Edwin N. Lavergne Jay S. Newman Ginsburg, Feldman and Bress, Chartered 1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20036

Counsel for Interactive Services Association

ITS, Inc.* 1919 M Street, NW Room 246 Washington, DC 20554